

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1 and 2 are objected to for the use of certain acronyms. The acronyms have been provided with identification.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Charisius et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0104071. This basis for rejection is traversed, because the recitations of claim 1 advert to matter not found in Charisius et al. The invention relates to a method for operating a track management system. As variously described in the application, and particularly at page 7, the sources of data are "a sensor or another system or subsystem, which generates signals which may be representative of the existence of a target or track, and possibly its location, dimensions, and velocity. Source 12 might be a radar system, for example, or another control and command system, or a LINK 4A, LINK 11, or LINK 16 interface, or any other source. According to an aspect of the invention, the track data signals are transmitted by way of a signal path 14 to a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) application server arrangement . . ." which is totally absent from Charisius et al.

More particularly, the recitations of claim 1 correspondingly recite inter alia

"generating data representing target information, and communicating said data to said COTS application server in the form of a Java Two Enterprise Edition (J2EE) compliant protocol;"

The Charisius et al. reference makes no mention whatever of a "target," but instead refers to a "target application

server." The "target application server" is a server, not a target. A "target application server" in the Charisius et al. context is therefore different from, and unrelated to, the "target" of claim 1. Thus, there is no step in Charisius et al. corresponding to the abovequoted step of "generating data." Consequently, claim 1 is patentable in a § 102 sense over Charisius et al.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Charisius et al. in view of Skufca et al. U.S. Pub No. 2003/0065827. This basis for rejection is traversed for lack of a proper nexus for Examiner's suggested combination of references. In addition, even assuming that the Charisius et al. and the Skufca et al. references can be combined notwithstanding the lack of a proper reference for such combination, neither suggests a track management system as recited in claim 2. In general, the Charisius et al. reference relates generally to the "generation of code" and the Skufca et al. reference relates to electronic business transaction processing.

Neither of the references suggests the step
"generating data representing target information, and communicating said data to said COTS application server in the form of a Java Two Enterprise Edition (J2EE) compliant protocol;"
and so the step cannot possibly be found in Examiner's suggested combination of references.

Claim 2 is therefore patentable in a §103 sense over Examiner's suggested combination of Charisius et al. and Skufca et al.

4. Reconsideration and allowance are requested

of claims 1 and 2.

5. No fee is believed to be required for this amendment. Please charge any other fees to deposit account 50-2061.

FOR THE APPLICANT(S)

by William H. Meise

William H. Meise
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,574

March 16, 2004
Duane Morris LLP
100 College Road West, Suite 100
Princeton, NJ 08540
609-919-4453